

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Responsive to the Office Action dated August 11, 2005, Claims 30-41 and 66-99 were previously withdrawn as being drawn to a nonelected election. In this Amendment, Claims 2, 29, 43 and 65 have been canceled and Claims 1 and 42 have been amended. Accordingly, Claims 1, 3-28, 42, and 44-64 remain pending for prosecution with Claims 1 and 42 being independent.

I. Objection to the Specification

The Abstract of the Disclosure was objected to because it includes that which may be implied. Applicant has amended the Abstract of Disclosure in accordance with the Examiner's comments and respectfully requests entry thereof.

II. Objections to the Claims

Claims 29 and 65 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant has canceled Claims 29 and 65 thereby rendering this objection moot.

III. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-29 and 42-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, it was asserted that the claimed method consists solely of the manipulation of an abstract idea and is not concrete or tangible. Claims 1 and 42 have been amended to recite that the method is computer-implemented. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-29 and 42-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,933,830 to Williams. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Williams does not anticipate the present invention because Williams fails to disclose each and every element of the invention as claimed. In particular, Williams fails to disclose assigning a reliability factor to each of the content items. Rather, Williams is merely directed to a system used for graphical information services that correlates a particular data point to a timeline and does contain any disclosure regarding the reliability of each data point.

Accordingly, Williams clearly does not teach a computer-implemented method for providing information over a communications network to a computer user that includes assigning a reliability factor to each content item of a data set. Because Williams does not teach all of the elements of Applicant's independent Claims 1 and 42 and the claims depending therefrom, it cannot therefore anticipate the invention as claimed.


V. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance and such is courteously solicited. If any issue regarding the allowability of any of the pending claims in the present application could be readily resolved, or if other action could be taken to further advance this application such as an Examiner's amendment, or if the Examiner should have any questions regarding the present amendment, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner please telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney in this regard. Applicant's request for a 3 month extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) as well as Applicant's petition fee are enclosed herewith and filed simultaneously with this response. The Commissioner is hereby

authorized to deduct any required fees or credit any overpayments in this application to Deposit
Account No. 11-0160.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 10, 2006



William B. Kircher
Reg. No. 22,481
Blackwell Sanders Peper Martin LLP
4801 Main St., Suite 1000
Kansas City, MO 64112
816-983-8000
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT